

TRANSCRIPT PREPARED BY THE CLERK OF THE LEGISLATURE  
Transcriber's Office  
FLOOR DEBATE

April 1, 2003

LB 210

to these requirements to furnish workmen's comp coverage. It does broaden the exemption. If you'll follow along, the key to this is on line 12 of the first page. The act shall not apply to...and then drop down to sub (d). Shall not apply to service performed by a worker when performed on a farm or ranch for an employer who is engaged in an agricultural operation and employs unrelated employees, unless...and then we go down to line 4, and the (ii)...40 percent or more of the employer's annual gross revenue is derived from the cultivation of land owned or leased by someone other than the employer...and here, the amendment now says...or a person related to the employer within the third degree by blood or marriage. This also goes down into line 9 then also in the same subsection. It's simply defining...or, enlarging the exemption of people an employer who may be feeding cattle or farming land of a father, a son, or maybe a grandson is farming land owned by his grandfather, and so on. It clarifies the fact that those people will be considered still as an employer, and it does not figure into the 40 percent or more of the employer's annual gross revenues derived from land owned by other people. Then, the employer or, the amendment, relatives...a person related to the employer within the third degree by blood or marriage. I'd be glad to answer any questions. It's trying to clarify an issue out there where an awfully lot of family farms are now very large operations, and they involve multi-generations in the operations. And rather than have one employer, say, a father that might be farming his father's son...land, and he has a son in the operation with land or cattle. And I think this is probably going to apply more often in the case of cattle feeding. I know that's where it came about in my district. There's a family-owned feedlot, and that feedlot feeds cattle for three generations of people. And within the one generation, I believe there's a couple of brothers. So I would ask for the adoption of the amendment. I think it clarifies the issue when...as to what is an employer, and it goes down to the third degree of relationship, either by blood or marriage. And it really is a plus to the family-owned, multi-generation, in many cases, or relatives, nieces and nephews involved, of course, would be covered. So I would ask for the adoption of the amendment. It's straightforward. It's trying to clarify some language and protect the family farm. With that, I would return the rest of my time to the Chair.